"Taenia"
Linnaeus, 1758
(Class Cestoidea);
use of the plenary
powers (1) to
designate "Taenia
solium" Linnaeus,
1758, as the type
species of, and (2)
to validate an
erroneous entry
relating to, in the
"Official List of
Generic Names in
Zoology"
(correction of an
error in
"Opinion" 84)

55. THE COMMISSION examined Note 7 of the "Editorial Notes" attached to the reissue in 1947 of Opinion 16, submitted by the Secretary to the Commission on the subject of an inconsistency in the treatment accorded to the generic name *Taenia* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Cestoidea) in Opinions 16 and 84, and the consequent error in the second of those Opinions in regard to the type species of that genus (Hemming, 1947, in Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature 1: 297-302). The Secretary to the Commission had pointed out that in Opinion 16 the Commission had correctly noted that in the original description of the genus Taenia, Linnaeus had cited the pre-1758 univerbal specific name "Taenia" as a synonym of one of the species (Taenia vulgaris) which he then included in that genus. Accordingly, under the interpretation of Rule (d) in Article 30 given in the foregoing Opinion, the species Taenia vulgaris Linnaeus, 1758, was the type species of the genus Taenia Linnaeus, 1758, by absolute tautonymy, unless it could be shown that the word "Taenia" as used by the pre-1758 author cited by Linnaeus had not been used as a univerbal specific name in the sense of "The Taenia". Some fifteen years after the publication of Opinion 16, the Commission had before them an application for a number of names to be placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology", one of which was the name Taenia Linnaeus, 1758. The applicant had asked that this name should be added to the "Official List" on the basis that its type species under the Règles was Taenia solium Linnaeus, 1758. In apparent total forgetfulness of what they had said about this generic name in Opinion 16, the Commission had thereupon in Opinion 84 placed the generic name Taenia Linnaeus on the "Official List" with Taenia solium Linnaeus as its type species, but without any indication as to how this species came to occupy that position. Everyone was agreed in treating Taenia solium Linnaeus as the type species of the genus Taenia Linnaeus; everyone was agreed also that great and totally unjustifiable confusion would arise, if, for any technical nomenclatorial reason, that species were to be displaced from its position as the type species of this important genus. Nevertheless, there was no doubt that under the Règles that species could no longer be accepted as the type species of the genus Taenia Linnaeus, unless either (a) it could be shown that the circumstances in which the word "Taenia" had been cited by Linnaeus as a synonym of Taenia vulgaris Linnaeus did not satisfy the requirements laid down in Opinion 16 and therefore that that species was not the type species of the genus Taenia Linnaeus by absolute

tautonymy, or (b) specialists subjectively identified the nominal species Taenia vulgaris Linnacus with Taenia solium Linnaeus. Noone had attempted to advance the first of these arguments, and there appeared no grounds on which a claim, so based, could be sustained. It must be accepted, therefore, that under the Règles the type species of the genus Taenia Linnaeus was Taenia vulgaris Linnaeus. Nor could any help be looked for from the second of the two possible lines of argument suggested above, for, far from identifying the nominal species Taenia vulgaris Linnaeus with the nominal species Taenia solium Linnaeus, specialists were agreed in identifying Taenia vulgaris with Taenia lata Linnaeus, 1758, the third of the four species placed by Linnaeus in the genus Taenia. Further, the trivial name vulgaris Linnaeus was usually sunk as a synonym of the trivial name lata Linnaeus, although the former had page precedence. Finally, it should be noted that the species lata Linnaeus (=vulgaris Linnaeus) was not regarded by specialists as even being congeneric with Taenia solium Linnaeus, the former species being referred either to the genus Dibothriocephalus Luhe, 1899, or to the genus Diphyllobothrium Cobbold, 1858. Thus, the strict application of the Règles in this case would create the maximum of confusion by not only removing the species bearing the trivial name solium Linnaeus from the genus Taenia Linnacus, of which it was universally accepted as the type species (following its selection as such by Braun in 1900). but also by the transfer of the universally known generic name Taenia Linnaeus to a genus for which that name was never used. The only way by which these disastrous results could be avoided would be by the Commission using their plenary powers to designate Taenia solium Linnaeus as the type species of the genus Taenia Linnaeus. therefore was the course which the Secretary to the Commission had recommended the Commission to adopt.

IN DISCUSSION it was agreed that it was unthinkable that the Commission should countenance the devastating confusion which would result from a strict application of the *Règles* in the present case. The plenary powers should certainly be used in the manner proposed.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) to use their plenary powers:—
 - (a) to set aside the indication of Taenia vulgaris Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus Taenia Linnaeus, 1758, by absolute tautonymy, and also all selections of that or other species to be the type species of this genus, made prior to the present decision;

- (b) to designate *Taenia solium* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the genus *Taenia* Linnaeus, 1758;
- (2) to insert in the entry in the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" relating to the generic name *Taenia* Linnaeus, 1758, a note stating that the species *Taenia solium* Linnaeus, 1758, was the type species of the foregoing genus by designation by the Commission under their plenary powers;
- (3) to place the trivial name solium Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination Taenia solium) on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology";
- (4) to render an *Opinion*, supplementary to *Opinion* 84, drawing attention to the error contained therein as respects the generic name *Taenia* Linnaeus, 1758, and recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

Schneider (J. G.), 1784, "Samml. Abhandl. Aufklar. Zoologie Handlungsge-schichte": (1) suppression under the plenary powers of the generic name "Octopodia" Schneider and of five trivial names published in that genus; (2) eight reputed generic names declared to be cheironyms;
(3) "Octopus" Cuvier, [1797], and "Eledone" Leach, 1817, placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology "

56. THE COMMISSION examined the Appendix annexed to Opinion 166, in which the Secretary to the Commission had pointed out that the alleged generic name Pompilus Schneider, 1784 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Nautiloidea), which was referred to in the discussion on the generic name Pompilus Fabricius, 1798 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) dealt with in Opinion 166, was a cheironym, that seven other reputed generic names alleged to have been published by Schneider in the same paper were also cheironyms but that the paper by that author in which those names were alleged to have been published did contain a new generic name (Octopodia), which, though completely overlooked by later authors, was an available name and had priority over the extremely well-known name Octopus Cuvier, [1797] (Hemming, 1945, in Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature 2: 388-394). In the foregoing paper, the Secretary to the Commission recalled that at their Session held at Lisbon in 1935, at which (in the absence of the Secretary through ill-health) he had officiated as Acting Secretary, the Commission had agreed that after the close of that Session he (Commissioner Hemming) should examine the bibliographical references cited in the documents considered at Lisbon with a view to correcting any errors that might be found therein, before the Report then submitted by the Commission to the Congress was published. It was in the discharge of the duty so entrusted to him that